

that would impose a 'gender identity' mandate here as well.

"In 2015, two spying instances were recorded in Virginia—one at a mall and one at a Walmart. Both instances involved a man in women's clothing who used a mirror and camera to take pictures of a mother and her 5-year-old daughter and a 53-year-old woman while they were in neighboring restroom stalls. The suspect wore a pink shirt and a long wig to present himself as a woman.

"In 2016, a man used a women's locker room at a public swimming pool in Washington State to undress in front of young girls who were changing for swim practice. When Seattle Parks and Recreation staff asked him to leave, the man claimed that 'the law has changed and I have a right to be here.' The man was apparently referring to a Washington State rule that allows individuals to use the bathroom that corresponds with their gender identity. However, the man made no attempt to present as a woman.

"As these examples illustrate, there are people who will abuse transgender policies. Although the Obama administration wants to keep its focus on bathrooms, its transgender directive goes much farther and actually requires biological male students who identify as female to be granted unfettered access to women's and girls' showers at school gyms.

"So what are women and girls to do when a biological male wearing a wig and makeup walks into an open shower next to them and they are shocked by the intrusion? According to the administration's directive, 'the desire to accommodate others' discomfort' is no reason at all to prevent transgender people from accessing the intimate facilities of their choice.

"Moreover, the directive prevents schools from requiring transgender people to have surgery, take hormones, have a medical diagnosis, or even act or dress in any particular way before having the 'right' to be treated exactly like a person of the opposite sex.

"The logical effect would be to silence women and girls who might otherwise speak out to prevent serious crimes from happening for fear that they would be accused of bigotry if they make the wrong call.

"The interests and desires of transgender persons, especially adults, shouldn't be placed over the privacy and safety of women and girls. There are ways of accommodating transgender people with private facilities without endangering and silencing women who could be hurt by policies allowing anyone unfettered access to their lockers, showers, and bathrooms."

That is from Melody Wood.

It also reminds me of back years ago when the issue of hate crimes was arising and we were going to punish people more severely based on what was in their minds, such as did they choose a person, a victim, based on their being a member of an identifiable group?

That created a problem for me as one who has sentenced felons up to and including the death penalty, because from the testimony we heard over and over, those who used to be called sociopaths under the old DSM-II became antisocial personality disorder. But they knew right from wrong. They just chose to do wrong. And they would pick victims at random. They didn't really care.

The people that testified in my court repeatedly made clear that if someone has this antisocial personality disorder, formerly sociopath, psychopath, they had less chance of being reformed and coming out of prison and shying away from wrongdoing. A lesser chance of reforming them.

Whereas the testimony indicated in different cases that if someone committed an act in the heat of passion—often it was a one-time crime that had to be punished for its own crime's sake, but that they were not likely to ever commit that crime again. There were some who committed crimes. They were not antisocial personality, but they had been brought up to hate a specific group or people, and they committed some act or crime against them.

I always made sure—it didn't matter whether they picked their victim because of sexual orientation—if they committed an assault of any kind, up to and including murder, I made sure they were punished severely for the crime they committed, because every person deserves to be protected from an assault.

So hate crimes comes in. And those who chose a person based on a hatred they were taught, there are indications there have been some great successes with confrontations between them after they were sentenced with victims or victims' families in which the person who was not an antisocial personality would weep and recant and apologize and beg for forgiveness and never have that kind of hatred again and would begin associating with people, whether they were of a different race, creed, color, or gender. They had a better chance of being rehabilitated.

Yet, the hate crime law came in. In fact, under the Federal law, if you convince a jury—just raise a reasonable doubt as a defendant—no, I didn't pick that victim because they were this, that, or the other; I just wanted to shoot somebody that day—if you raise a reasonable doubt that you may have randomly picked the victim, it is a complete defense to the Federal hate crime law. That is a messed up law.

I also gave the example that, based on so many of the hate crime laws, you could someday—and I was called crazy and all kind of names for giving this example—but the example I thought many years ago that was appropriate, based on the hate crimes legislation, is that you could have a situation where a mother and her young daughter are standing on a street corner, somebody opens their trench coat and flashes the

daughter, and the mother, out of that protective instinct they have to protect the child, hits the flasher with her purse.

The flasher—in a lot of jurisdictions, that is a minimal misdemeanor—probably would never do any jail time. He might have to pay a fine or spend 1 day in jail. But because the woman hit him because of his sexual orientation toward flashing, then she is now guilty under many hate crime laws of committing a felony and can get prison time under these misguided hate crime laws. And I warned that we would get to this point.

And then when I hear on the news some woman got mad when a guy came in dressed as a woman, scared her, and she hit him, then she gets arrested. This is what happens. This is the kind of miscarriage of justice you get when we don't base laws on facts.

And then we have this article from Rebecca Kheel. Of course, most of us have heard the headlines. We know the Department of Veterans Affairs, or the VA, has had problems. People have been dying while waiting to get the treatment they needed.

And now the VA proposes covering surgeries for transgender vets. They are not even taking care of the vets when they need help, and now they are going to take up a procedure that Johns Hopkins says does more harm than good, that the best study in the world from Sweden says they are going to be 20 times more likely to kill themselves.

Have we not lost enough veterans already? The VA wants to make them 20 times more vulnerable to suicide than they already are?

It is time to stop the nonsense. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, having reviewed the information that Dr. Paul McHugh from Johns Hopkins provided and Walt Heyer provided and that I looked into based on their direction, one thing is imminently clear: the issue of transgender is not based on biological science, it is not based on medical science, it is not based on physical science, it is not based on chemical science. There is only one science that this whole transgender issue before the Congress is based on, and that is political science.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2576) "An Act to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on